

§ 29.601

may occur during manufacture or operation; and

(v) An assessment of the residual strength and fatigue characteristics of all PSEs that supports the replacement times and inspection intervals established under paragraph (d)(2) of this section.

(2) Each applicant must establish replacement times, inspections, or other procedures for all PSEs to require the repair or replacement of damaged parts before a catastrophic failure. These replacement times, inspections, or other procedures must be included in the Airworthiness Limitations Section of the Instructions for Continued Airworthiness required by § 29.1529.

(i) Replacement times for PSEs must be determined by tests, or by analysis supported by tests, and must show that the structure is able to withstand the repeated loads of variable magnitude expected in-service. In establishing these replacement times, the following items must be considered:

(A) Damage identified in the threat assessment required by paragraph (d)(1)(iv) of this section;

(B) Maximum acceptable manufacturing defects and in-service damage (*i.e.*, those that do not lower the residual strength below ultimate design loads and those that can be repaired to restore ultimate strength); and

(C) Ultimate load strength capability after applying repeated loads.

(ii) Inspection intervals for PSEs must be established to reveal any damage identified in the threat assessment required by paragraph (d)(1)(iv) of this section that may occur from fatigue or other in-service causes before such damage has grown to the extent that the component cannot sustain the required residual strength capability. In establishing these inspection intervals, the following items must be considered:

(A) The growth rate, including no-growth, of the damage under the repeated loads expected in-service determined by tests or analysis supported by tests;

(B) The required residual strength for the assumed damage established after considering the damage type, inspection interval, detectability of damage, and the techniques adopted for damage

detection. The minimum required residual strength is limit load; and

(C) Whether the inspection will detect the damage growth before the minimum residual strength is reached and restored to ultimate load capability, or whether the component will require replacement.

(3) Each applicant must consider the effects of damage on stiffness, dynamic behavior, loads, and functional performance on all PSEs when substantiating the maximum assumed damage size and inspection interval.

(e) Fatigue Evaluation: If an applicant establishes that the damage tolerance evaluation described in paragraph (d) of this section is impractical within the limits of geometry, inspectability, or good design practice, the applicant must do a fatigue evaluation of the particular composite rotorcraft structure and:

(1) Identify all PSEs considered in the fatigue evaluation;

(2) Identify the types of damage for all PSEs considered in the fatigue evaluation;

(3) Establish supplemental procedures to minimize the risk of catastrophic failure associated with the damages identified in paragraph (d) of this section; and

(4) Include these supplemental procedures in the Airworthiness Limitations section of the Instructions for Continued Airworthiness required by § 29.1529.

[Doc. No. FAA-2009-0660, Amdt. 29-59, 76 FR 74664, Dec. 1, 2011]

Subpart D—Design and Construction

GENERAL

§ 29.601 Design.

(a) The rotorcraft may have no design features or details that experience has shown to be hazardous or unreliable.

(b) The suitability of each questionable design detail and part must be established by tests.

§ 29.602 Critical parts.

(a) *Critical part.* A critical part is a part, the failure of which could have a catastrophic effect upon the rotorcraft, and for which critical characterists

have been identified which must be controlled to ensure the required level of integrity.

(b) If the type design includes critical parts, a critical parts list shall be established. Procedures shall be established to define the critical design characteristics, identify processes that affect those characteristics, and identify the design change and process change controls necessary for showing compliance with the quality assurance requirements of part 21 of this chapter.

[Doc. No. 29311, 64 FR 46232, Aug. 24, 1999]

§ 29.603 Materials.

The suitability and durability of materials used for parts, the failure of which could adversely affect safety, must—

(a) Be established on the basis of experience or tests;

(b) Meet approved specifications that ensure their having the strength and other properties assumed in the design data; and

(c) Take into account the effects of environmental conditions, such as temperature and humidity, expected in service.

(Secs. 313(a), 601, 603, 604, and 605 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1354(a), 1421, 1423, 1424), and sec. 6(c), Dept. of Transportation Act (49 U.S.C. 1655(c)))

[Doc. No. 5084, 29 FR 16150, Dec. 3, 1964, as amended by Amdt. 29-12, 41 FR 55471, Dec. 20, 1976; Amdt. 29-17, 43 FR 50599, Oct. 30, 1978]

§ 29.605 Fabrication methods.

(a) The methods of fabrication used must produce consistently sound structures. If a fabrication process (such as gluing, spot welding, or heat-treating) requires close control to reach this objective, the process must be performed according to an approved process specification.

(b) Each new aircraft fabrication method must be substantiated by a test program.

(Secs. 313(a), 601, 603, 604, Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1354(a), 1421, 1423, 1424), sec. 6(c), Dept. of Transportation Act (49 U.S.C. 1655(c)))

[Doc. No. 5084, 29 FR 16150, Dec. 3, 1964, as amended by Amdt. 29-17, 43 FR 50599, Oct. 30, 1978]

§ 29.607 Fasteners.

(a) Each removable bolt, screw, nut, pin, or other fastener whose loss could jeopardize the safe operation of the rotorcraft must incorporate two separate locking devices. The fastener and its locking devices may not be adversely affected by the environmental conditions associated with the particular installation.

(b) No self-locking nut may be used on any bolt subject to rotation in operation unless a nonfriction locking device is used in addition to the self-locking device.

[Amdt. 29-5, 33 FR 14533, Sept. 27, 1968]

§ 29.609 Protection of structure.

Each part of the structure must—

(a) Be suitably protected against deterioration or loss of strength in service due to any cause, including—

- (1) Weathering;
- (2) Corrosion; and
- (3) Abrasion; and

(b) Have provisions for ventilation and drainage where necessary to prevent the accumulation of corrosive, flammable, or noxious fluids.

§ 29.610 Lightning and static electricity protection.

(a) The rotorcraft structure must be protected against catastrophic effects from lightning.

(b) For metallic components, compliance with paragraph (a) of this section may be shown by—

(1) Electrically bonding the components properly to the airframe; or

(2) Designing the components so that a strike will not endanger the rotorcraft.

(c) For nonmetallic components, compliance with paragraph (a) of this section may be shown by—

(1) Designing the components to minimize the effect of a strike; or

(2) Incorporating acceptable means of diverting the resulting electrical current to not endanger the rotorcraft.

(d) The electric bonding and protection against lightning and static electricity must—

(1) Minimize the accumulation of electrostatic charge;

(2) Minimize the risk of electric shock to crew, passengers, and service